



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/390,554	09/03/1999	DANILO PAU	98AG07053137	7097

27975 7590 04/01/2003

ALLEN, DYER, DOPPELT, MILBRATH & GILCHRIST P.A.  
1401 CITRUS CENTER 255 SOUTH ORANGE AVENUE  
P.O. BOX 3791  
ORLANDO, FL 32802-3791

EXAMINER

PARSONS, CHARLES E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2613

DATE MAILED: 04/01/2003

116

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

2

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/390,554

Applicant(s)

PAU ET AL. D

Examiner

Charles E Parsons

Art Unit

2613

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 18 March 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:


Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

  
**CHRIS KELLEY**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicants arguments are not persuasive. The suggestion for scalability comes from Zhao on page one second paragraph of his article. "In order to improve the decoded image quality, the size of the divided blocks has to be decreased which results in smaller compression". Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art, can infer scalability. The scalability would then require a mathematical formula to determine the size of the range blocks as a function of the domain blocks. For example if the domain were to be 8X8 blocks then it would follow that the range blocks would have to be 4X4 blocks or 2X2 blocks or  $N/(2 \text{ to the } i \text{ power } i \text{ being } 1 \text{ for a first order reduction and } 2 \text{ for a second order reduction})$ . The applicant is reminded that Mathematical formulas are not patentable. See the following case law In Re Gottschalk v. Benson, 175 USPQ 673 (S. Ct. 1972, In re Richman, 195 USPQ 340 (CCPA 1977) In re Christensen, 178 USPQ 35 (CCPA 1973 and In re Chatfield, 191 USPQ 730 (CCPA 1976) In the present case as claimed, the Applicant is simply deriving a formula from the range and domain. As for the parallel processing argument the Examiner used Ericsson to show that parallel processing was well known in the art, and advantageous when a task lends itself to it. In this case, video processing can be done in parallel as taught by Ericsson.